



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/006,585	12/10/2001	Kazuaki Matoba	1190-0533P	4965
2292	7590	05/25/2005	EXAMINER	
BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH PO BOX 747 FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747			KOVAL, MELISSA J	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		2851		

DATE MAILED: 05/25/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/006,585	MATOBA ET AL.	
	Examiner Melissa J. Koval	Art Unit 2851	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on April 13, 2005.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 2-10 and 15-20 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1 and 11-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 10 December 2001 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

This application contains claims 2-10 and 15-20 are drawn to an invention nonelected with traverse in the Response to the Election of Species made by applicant on December 22, 2004. A complete reply to the final rejection must include cancellation of nonelected claims or other appropriate action (37 CFR 1.144) See MPEP § 821.01.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1 and 11 through 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Vanderwilt et al. U.S. Patent 6,693,661 B1.

See Figures 1 and 3, for example.

Claim 1 sets forth: "A projector comprising (See video conferencing system 100):

an optical engine which projects an image based on a video signal (See column 3, lines 30 through 40.);
a circuit section which controls operation of said optical engine (See column 3, lines 41 through 65.);

a power source which supplies electric power to said circuit section (See column 3, lines 56 through 65.);
a network interface, through which said circuit section communicates with a remote network terminal device (Network Interface 126); and
a hub (network hub 128) which is connected to said network interface, said hub said network interface being connected to said including ports, remote network terminal device through one of said ports, electric power from said power source being supplied to said hub." Also see column 3, lines 66 and 67, and column 4, lines 1 through 22.

Claim 11 sets forth: "The projector according to claim 1, wherein said circuit image regarding section causes said optical engine to project an information of said remote network terminal device connected to said hub." See video monitor 110, PC 132 and LAN 130.

Claim 12 sets forth: "The projector according to claim 1, wherein said circuit section causes said optical engine to project an image based on a video signal input to said circuit section." Again refer to column lines 56 through 65 wherein details of ISDN interface 122 and ISDN lines 108 providing an electrical connection to VCU 102 are given.

Claim 13 sets forth: "The projector according to claim 1, further comprising an operating section, through which an operator inputs to said circuit section a command for selecting a video signal to be projected from video signals input to said ports of said hub." See user controls 134. Also see column 4, lines 23 through 40.

Claim 14 sets forth: "The projector according to claim 1, wherein said hub is a

switching hub." See column 4, lines 5 through 8.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed April 13, 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant states the following on page 1 of his remarks:

"Vanderwilt's video conferencing unit 102 is not a projector as recited in claim 1.

In fact, the videoconferencing unit 102 does not even include any type of device such as "an optical engine which projects an image based on a video signal" as recited in claim

1. Video data is processed by the VCU 102 of Vanderwilt, but the video data is then sent to a video monitor 110 for display. Essentially, the VCU 102 of Vanderwilt acts as a hub for processing various data during a video conferencing."

These remarks set forth by applicant are contradictory and in fact support and strengthen the rejection made by the examiner in the Office Action of February 10, 2005. In the Office Action of February 10, 2005, repeated above, the examiner does not actually refer to VCU 102 as the projector, as is suggested by applicant. Again see column 3, lines 30 through 40, that meet the limitation "an optical engine which projects an image based on a video signal" wherein the patent teaches:

VCU 102 simultaneously receives video and audio information (typically representative of the images and speech of the remote conference participants) from the remote conference endpoint. The received video and audio information is processed by VCU 102 and the processed video and audio information is directed to a video monitor 110 and speakers 112 so as to present to the near conference participants the images and speech of the remote conference participants. The VCU 102 may also receive input from or direct output to other peripheral devices, such as a videocassette player/recorder, document camera or LCD projector. 30
35
40

In addition to the reference to an LCD projector therein, video monitor 110 is a rear projection system, as are many video monitors.

Applicant submits that the examiner's rejection is incorrect for only those reasons given above, and as reiterated on page 3 of his remarks: "Simply stated, Vanderwilt's videoconferencing unit is not a projector as claimed." Because applicant's remarks are not persuasive, and no detailed projection structure is claimed by the applicant, the examiner asserts that the rejection of claims 1 and 11 through 14 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Vanderwilt et al. U.S. Patent 6,693,661 B1, is proper and is therefore maintained.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Levis et al. U.S. Patent 4,734,779 teaches a video projection system. A rear projection video display system is shown in the Figures.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Melissa J Koval whose telephone number is (571) 272-2121. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Judy Nguyen can be reached on (571) 272-2258. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

MJK



A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Melissa J Koval" twice, once in a larger, more formal style and once in a smaller, more cursive style below it.